



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/764,392 01/19/2001		Masato Nakajima	24500	7547	
20529 75	590 10/13/2005		EXAMINER		
NATH & ASSOCIATES			AHMED, SAMIR ANWAR		
1030 15th STR 6TH FLOOR	EET, NW		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
WASHINGTON, DC 20005			2623		
		DATE MAILED: 10/13/2005			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/764,392	NAKAJIMA ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Samir A. Ahmed	2623		

		Carrii 7t. 7tiinica	2020	
The I	MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILE	ED <u>27 September 2005</u> FAILS TO PLACE THI	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION	FOR ALLOWANCE.	
this applica places the a Request time period		wing replies: (1) an amendment, a stice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply r	iffidavit, or other evider a compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
. ==	riod for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date	-		
no even	iod for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A it, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la er Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or	ater than SIX MONTHS from the maili	ing date of the final rejecti	on.
	ONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7		ie i iitor itel er ivitor	
have been filed is t under 37 CFR 1.17 set forth in (b) abov	may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date he date for purposes of determining the period of ex (a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the eye, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later arned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) PEAL	tension and the corresponding amour shortened statutory period for reply or r than three months after the mailing o	nt of the fee. The appropri iginally set in the final Offi	ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
filing the No	of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp otice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)),	to avoid dismissal of th	
3. The propo	sed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brie	ef, will <u>not</u> be entered b	ecause
	raise new issues that would require further co		OTE below);	
	raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo			
appe	are not deemed to place the application in be		, ,	the issues for
	present additional claims without canceling a		ejected claims.	
	FE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
	dments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		Compliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
	s reply has overcome the following rejection(s)			
non-allowal	posed or amended claim(s) would be all ble claim(s).	·	•	_
how the ne The status Claim(s) all Claim(s) ob Claim(s) re	ojected to: jected: <u>1, <i>4-10, 12-15</i></u> .		vill be entered and an e	explanation of
	thdrawn from consideration:			
8. The affidav because ap	OTHER EVIDENCE it or other evidence filed after a final action, bu oplicant failed to provide a showing of good an rlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
entered bed	it or other evidence filed after the date of filing cause the affidavit or other evidence failed to o good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome all rejections under app	eal and/or appellant fai	Is to provide a
	vit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after	entry is below or attach	ned.
11. X The reque	est for reconsideration has been considered buinuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application	in condition for allowar	nce because:
12. Note the a	attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper	No(s)	
is. U Other:	·			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments filed 9/27/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the folowing reasons:

Applicant alleges, "To establish a Prima facie case of obviousness [,]" (page 3, line 2-page 5, line 13. The Examiner disagrees. Firstly, Applicants' arguments are against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); In re Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Secondly, Kamada et al. clearly discloses extracting a plurality of reagions such as text, table, frame etc. (see Fig. 3B S2). Thirdly, Kazuyuki et al. discloses judging a rectangle corresponding to figure, photograph, table by projecting in the horizontal and vertical directions (fig. 7) according to a number of peaks detected in the projection as depicted in Figures 6, 8 and 17-19 (col. 10, line 10-col. 11, line 57). Fourthly, The Examiner cannot find any where in the language of claim 1 that the attribute judged as "others" (i.e. unknown) is determined according to a number of peaks detected from the projection data. Claim 1 merely recites "a first judgment means for judging whether an attribute of the rectangle region is one of a "character" and "ruled-line", and "other" (unknown) and wang et al. meets this claim language. It is clear that the Examiner has established a prima facie case of obviousness because the combination of references disclose all the claimed limitations and the motivation to combine is taught in the references themselves.

SAMIR AHMED PRIMARY EXAMINER